

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

10/5

783

RECEIVED

2004 -10- 06

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

U-A PD

To: Amersham Biosciences AB Patent Department Björkgatan 30 751 84 Uppsala	DUE DATE:	3 Dec 2004	PCT WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 66)
	FORMALITIES:	RP ✓ # 4/	
	CLASSIFICATION:	AK ✓	
	CASE NO:	7/10/04 PU 02103-PCT	
Date of mailing (day/month/year)		04 -10- 2004	

Applicant's or agent's file reference PU02103-PCT		REPLY DUE within 60 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/SE2003/001434	International filing date (day/month/year) 12.09.2003	Priority date (day/month/year) 31.10.2002
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C07C 275/00, C07D 213/81, A61P 37/00, C07D 233/34, A61K 31/17, C12Q 1/58		
Applicant Amersham Biosciences AB et al		
G01N 33/62//C08G 71/02, A01N 47/28, C07K 16/00		

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

- ☐ The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:
☐ is ☐ is not
considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.
- This first (first, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
 - ☐ Box No. II Priority
 - ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
 - ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - ☒ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
 - ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
 - ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application
- The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(e).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6. For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
- The final date by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 28.02.2005

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/SE Patent- och registreringsverket Box 5055 S-102 42 STOCKHOLM Facsimile No. 46 8 667 72 88	Authorized officer Fernando Farieta/BS Telephone No. 46 8 782 25 00
--	---

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/SE2003/001434

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:

- ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of *(replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed.")*:

☒ the international application as originally filed/furnished

☐ the description:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ the claims:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ the drawings:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) – see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages _____

☐ the claims, Nos. _____

☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____

☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

4. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

☐ the description, pages _____

☐ the claims, Nos. _____

☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____

☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/SE2003/001434

Box No. II Priority

1. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the failure to furnish within the prescribed time limit the requested:

☐ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 66.7(a))
☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 66.7(b))
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid ((Rule 64.1)). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

The priority is considered to be valid.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/SE2003/001434

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

☐ the entire international application

☒ claims Nos. 20

because:

☒ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 20
relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

See PCT Rule 67.1.(iv).: Methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy, as well as diagnostic methods.

☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 13-14
are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported
by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

☒ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 13-14

☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form	<input type="checkbox"/>	has not been furnished
	<input type="checkbox"/>	does not comply with the standard
the computer readable form	<input type="checkbox"/>	has not been furnished
	<input type="checkbox"/>	does not comply with the standard

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in the Annex C-*bis* of the Administrative Instructions.

☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/SE2003/001434

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>2-12, 15-19 and 21 (Y)</u>
	Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	
	Claims	<u>2-12, 15-19 and 21 (N)</u>
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>2-12, 15-19 and 21 (Y)</u>
	Claims	

2. Citations and explanations:

The following documents have been found to be relevant:

D1: EP 0 743 067 A2

"Use of urea and thiourea compounds for elimination or detoxification of superantigens from body fluids"

D2: WO 02/076930 A2

"Substituted diarylureas as stimulators for FAS-mediated apoptosis".

D3: "A highly sensitive and rapid ELISA for the arylurea herbicides diuron, monuron and linuron". Schneider et al J. Agric. Food. Chem. Vol 42(1994)p413-422.

Novelty (N)

The claimed invention relates to arylurea compounds and separation matrix for affinity chromatography thereof.

The problem to be solved is to develop alternative IgG-binding ligands in order to avoid the disadvantages of known IgG-binding ligands (pages 5-7 description).

The applicant has identified a binding site that exhibits the spatial conformation specific for human kappa IgGs of all subtypes (page 5, last paragraph). The claimed invention provides ligands to the identified binding site (Arylureas on Figure 3).

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/SE2003/001434

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of: BOX V

Document D1 discloses material which has a highly selective absorption of super antigens containing urea bonds or thiourea bonds. Figure 1 in document D1 shows the advantages of using urea-bonds compared to benzene-rings in separation matrixes. The formulas I-III show alternative urea compounds according to claims 4, 13, 24 and 32.

Document D2 comprises urea compounds (formula I) for bioassays (claim 20) and for the treatment of autoimmune diseases.

Document D3 disclose diuron, monuron and linuron compounds (figure 1 compounds 6-10), arylurea compounds useful as enzyme tracers or coating antigens (page 414, first column).

The claimed arylurea compounds and separation matrix for affinity chromatography are not considered to be within the scope of documents D1-D3, therefore claims 2-12, 15-19 and 20 are considered to be novel.

The feature arylurea is merely one of several straightforward possibilities from the similar structures presented in documents D1-D3, which the skilled person would select, in accordance with circumstances, without the exercise of inventive skill, in order to solve the problem posed.

The invention according to claims 2-12, 15-19 and 21 is not considered to involve an inventive step.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/SE2003/001434

Box No. VI Certain documents cited

1. Certain published documents (Rule 70.10)

Application No. Patent No.	Publication date (day/month/year)	Filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (valid claim) (day/month/year)
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

2. Non-written disclosures (Rule 70.9)

Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-written disclosure (day/month/year)	Date of written disclosure referring to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
--------------------------------	--	---

(P,X) "QSAR and classification of murine and human soluble
epoxide hydrolase inhibition by urea-like compounds"
J Med Chem Vol 46 (2003) p1066-1080 tables I-II

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/SE2003/001434

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Present claim 1 relates to urea compounds defined by reference to a desirable characteristic or property, namely "compound having affinity for human IgG of k-type".

The claim cover all urea compounds having this characteristic or property, whereas the application provides support within the meaning of Article 6 PCT and / or disclosure within the meaning of Article 5 PCT for only a very limited number of such compounds. In the present case, the claims so lack support, and the application so lacks disclosure, that a meaningful examination over the whole of the claimed scope is impossible. Independent of the above reasoning, the claims also lacks clarity (Article 6 PCT).

Consequently, the examination has been carried out for those parts of the claim which appear to be clear, supported and disclosed, namely those parts relating to the urea compounds in figure 3.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☒ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☒ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☒ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.